REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated May 22, 2006, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on August 22, 2006. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

Claims 1-3, 6-9, 11-19, 21-27 and 29-35 are pending in the application. Claims 9, 11-18 and 25 remain pending following entry of this response. Claims 11 and 25 have been amended. Claims 1-8, 10, 19-24 and 26-35 have been canceled. Applicants submit that the amendment does not introduce new matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-3, 6-8, 11,19, 21-27, 29-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Bargeron et al.* US 20040205545 (hereinafter, "*Bargeron*") in view of US 6519603 (hereinafter *Bays*).

Claims 9 and 12-18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Bargeron* in view of *Bays* and in further view of *Anderson et al.* US 5,537,526 (hereinafter, "*Anderson et al.*"), and in further view of US5253362 (*Nolan*).

Claims 1-8, 19-24 and 26-35 have been canceled. With respect to the remaining claims, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The Examiner bears the initial burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness. *See* MPEP § 2142. To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine the reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Third, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. *See* MPEP § 2143. The present rejection fails to establish at least the third criteria.

With respect to the third criteria, the references fails to teach at least an annotation browser *configured to display annotations and links to associated annotated data objects wherein selecting the links to the associated data objects causes an application used to manipulate the associated data objects to be invoked,* as claimed in independent claims 9 and 25.

The Examiner argues that Anderson discloses an annotation browser configured in this manner. The system disclosed in Anderson may use links to associate an annotation with parts of a document to which an annotation refers. These links are not displayed to a user, however, as recited in claims 9 and 25 (see column 5, lines 11-12). Because these links are not displayed to a user, there is no teaching of selecting a link and certainly no teaching of invoking an application used to manipulate the associated data objects in response to selecting the links.

Therefore, Applicants submit claim 9, and its dependents, as well as claim 25, are allowable, and respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

Conclusion

Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted, and
S-signed pursuant to 37 CFR 1.4,

/Randol W. Read, Reg. No. 43,876/
Randol W. Read
Registration No. 43,876
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056
Telephone: (713) 623-4844
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846
Attorney for Applicants